



**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA**  
First Floor 33/11 kV substation, Hyderabad Boats Club Lane  
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

:: Present:: Smt. UDAYA GOURI

Friday the Twelfth Day of April 2019

**Appeal No. 61 of 2018**

Preferred against Order dt:28.11.2018 of CGRF in  
CG No. 563/2018-19 of Suryapet Circle

Between

Sri. V. Prabhakar, S/o. Suraiah, H.No. 6-81, Jajireddygudem Post,  
Jajireddygudem (V&M), Suryapet Dist - 508224. Cell:9052616522.

... Appellant

**AND**

1. The AE/OP/J.R.Gudem/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.
2. The ADE/OP/D.Nagaram/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.
3. The AAO/ERO/Thungathurthy/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.
4. The DE/OP/Suryapet/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.
5. The SE/OP/Suryapet Circle/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 21.01.2019, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 07.03.2019 at Hyderabad. Appellant being absent Sri. P. Uma Maheshwar Rao - AAE/OP/J.R.Gudem was present for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

**AWARD**

This is an Appeal against the orders of CGRF -1 pertaining to Suryapet CG No.563/2018-19 Dt.28.11.2018.

2. The contention of the Appellant is that he lodged a complaint before CGRF-1 alleging that his service meter bearing No. SC 4241500699 Category II has jumped in the month of August,2016 resulting in abnormal bills showing abnormal consumption and that he has lodged a complaint before AE,ADE & DE/Operations

seeking for rectification of abnormal bills issued to him, but no action was being taken. The learned CGRF having heard his allegations failed to appreciate the same and directed him to pay the bills as per the bills issued by the Respondents and as such aggrieved by the same the present appeal is filed.

3. The Appellant i.e. Sri. V. Prabhakar, S/o. Suriah, R/o. H.No.6-81, Jajireddygudem, Suryapet averred that SC No. 4241500699 under Category II was allotted to him and that in the month of August, 2016 he received abnormal bill as such he sought for rectification of the said bills and since neither the Respondents nor the CGRF-I responded to his complaint, he has filed the present Appeal.

4. The Respondents through Respondent No.1 submitted the written averments vide Lr.No.392 dt.09.02.2018 stating that the said consumer is having SC No.4241500699 using supply for commercial purpose at Jaji Reddy Gudem (V) & (M).

That the meter has been tested and found normal. However the meter is replaced. There is no scope of defect in the meter, since the billing is in IR mode i.e. INFRARED billing, there is no possibility of any mistakes in the billing.

The bill has been revised to Rs 5757/- duly withdrawing the excess demand of Rs 1750/-. Further Rs 1034/- also been reduced to maximum extent possible.

Hence, revision of bill does not arise. It is also stated that the consumer is having habit of creating false allegations unnecessarily.

In the past, there was a theft case of tapping direct supply to his domestic service No. 4241501553 in the same premises when the service was under disconnection. The supply has been restored after payment made by him as assessed by DPE wing and the Hon'ble CGRF also upheld our action, hence pointed out there is no possibility of rectification of the Appellant's bills as claimed by him.

5. In the face of the said averments by both sides, the court framed the following issues:-

1. Whether the bills pertaining to SC No. 4241500699 belonging to the Appellant requires to be rectified? And
2. To what relief?

## Heard Both Sides.

### Issue No. 1

6. Admittedly SC No. 4241500699 under Category II belongs to the Appellant and his contention is that the meter pertaining to the said service connection jumped in the month of August,2016 and as a result he has been getting abnormal bills. The Respondents on the other hand contended that the said contentions of the Appellant is not true and that he is in the habit of creating litigations. They pointed out that in spite of getting the meter of the service connection belonging to the Appellant being tested at MRT lab, Suryapet and found to be functioning normally and a new meter being fixed, the Appellant is still continuing to litigate without paying the bills since August,2016.

7. In the face of the said contentions by both sides, the periodical consumption chart of the SC No. 4241500699 under Category II belonging to the Appellant submitted by the Respondents themselves show that admittedly there is a discrepancy in the consumption of the Appellant under the said service connection. The units consumed though went to the extent of 80 as per the consumption chart in that year, the same never showed consumption above 100, but in the month of August,2016 the consumption of units was shown as 201 units. The Respondents stated that the said discrepancy in the said consumption for the month of August,2016 was taken into consideration by the Respondents in spite of the report of AE/M&P/Suryapet vide Lr.No.126 Dt.03.09.2016 which is as follows:-

#### TEST RESULTS:-

Sl.No.	KWH	M.D KW	DATE	TIME
Final FR	843	0.56	03.09.2016	13:00
1	774	0.87	29.08.2016	06.00
2.	595	0.38	31.07.2016	19:30
3	473	0.41	24.06.2016	19:00
4	373	0.45	01.05.2016	19:00
5	339	0.44	19.04.2016	21:00
6	317	0.42	10.03.2016	19:00

i. % Error was found within limits. **No error** found test conducted with Zera Kit at different pulses and loads. **No creeping** is observed without load by conducting creeping test.

ii. **No defective of meter.** So the meter performance is good and satisfactory. The meter final reading is 843.

8. The said actions of the Respondents go to show that in spite of the report of the AE/M&P/Suryapet, the Respondents apportioned the 200 units for a period of one year and withdraw a total amount of Rs 1750/- apart from AE/OP/JR Gudem withdrawing Rs 1034/- in spite of there being no fault with the meter as claimed by the Appellant and the Appellant though claimed that his meter jumped in the month of August, 2016 failed to file any document to support his claim except showing the discrepancy in the consumption chart issued by the Respondents. Hence in the said circumstances the Court concludes that the finding of the CGRF does not require to be interfered. Hence decides this issue against the Appellant.

#### **Issue No.2**

9. In the result the Appeal is dismissed confirming the orders of the CGRF-I in CG No. 563/2018-19 and the Respondents are directed to issue a demand notice for the payment of arrears if any within 7 days from the date of this order.

TYPED BY Office Executive cum Computer Operator, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this the 12th day of April, 2019.

**Sd/-**

**Vidyut Ombudsman**

1. Sri. V. Prabhakar, S/o. Suraiah, H.No. 6-81, Jajireddygudem Post, Jajireddygudem (V&M), Suryapet Dist - 508224. Cell:9052616522.
2. The AE/OP/J.R.Gudem/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.
3. The ADE/OP/D.Nagaram/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.
4. The AAO/ERO/Thungathurthy/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.
5. The DE/OP/Suryapet/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.
6. The SE/OP/Suryapet Circle/TSSPDCL/Suryapet Dist.

**Copy to :**

7. The Chairperson, CGRF-I, TSSPDCL, GTS Colony, Vengal Rao Nagar, Hyderabad.
8. The Secretary, TSERC, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapul, Hyd.